

# W5YI

National Volunteer Examiner Coordinator

## REPORT

Up to the minute news from the world of amateur radio, personal computing and emerging electronics. While no guarantee is made, information is from sources we believe to be reliable. May be reproduced providing credit is given to The W5YI Report.

Fred Maia, W5YI, Editor, P.O. Box 565101, Dallas, TX 75356-5101

### ★ In This Issue ★

**Ham Stations Inspected Nationwide**  
**Complete Wrap Up on Why and...**  
**What Could be the Ultimate Result!**  
**Interview with F.O.B.'s Dan Emrick**  
**And F.O.B. Chief Richard M. Smith**  
**Examination Statistics for Feb. 1991**  
**FCC Adopts Rules for Land Mobile**  
**Use of 220-222 MHz Band**  
**MACC: Spread Spectrum Interference**  
**Requests for Spectrum Swamp FCC**  
**"Market Based" Approach Wanted**  
**SAREX and STS-37 to Launch April 4**  
**Global Ham Radio Licensing Petition**  
**...and much, much more!**

Vol. 13, Issue #7

\$1.50

PUBLISHED TWICE A MONTH

April 1, 1991

## FCC INSPECTS HAM STATIONS NATIONWIDE!

During the month of February 1991, officers of the FCC's Field Operations Bureau (FOB) made a "concerted push" to inspect Amateur Radio stations throughout the country. We don't have an accurate count of the number of stations visited -- an FCC official says around 200. The inspectors asked ham operators to transmit and cut power 50%. Inspectors then made wattmeter measurements and obtained signal reports from hams on the other side of the QSO as to the effect of the reduced power. Thus, some news stories termed these inspections "power audits".

Some plausible reasons for the inspections have emerged. Some of the stations were subjects of radio-frequency interference (RFI) complaints, for example. But why the mysterious power-level checks for everybody? Who requested a massive data-gathering effort on amateur power levels? How will this information be used? Amateurs who asked the inspectors these questions characterized the answers as "evasive".

### Surprise visits

Many stations were inspected from coast to coast. A couple of interesting examples:

Unannounced and during dinner, **Dr. Wayne Hudson/KT7G** of Seattle was visited by FCC inspectors. When he asked why, he was told that

FCC Washington had directed a test of power levels, and that **KT7G** was selected because "we knew you had an amplifier." (Hudson was previously inspected in connection with a RFI case. He spent \$24,000 in legal fees, and the case established a precedent, Hudson told us, that the FCC has exclusive jurisdiction over RFI matters.)

Another Seattle amateur, **Tom Owens, K7RI**, received an unexpected FCC inspection that resulted in a \$225 *Notice of Apparent Liability*. The inspector cited him for running too much power during a test prior to the inspection -- **K7RI** was testing for relay breakdowns in phasing boxes -- and for failure to ID and running 250 W in a Nov-ice band. "He wasn't in the shack during the test," Owens said. "He shouldn't have told me to continue doing what I'm doing and then fine me." The inspector objected to a temporary 80 meter dipole Owens had attached to a telephone pole for receiving only -- and the next day a city official arrived and told **K7RI** to remove the antenna.

### Power levels and RFI/TVI

Amateurs are concerned that the FCC may try to use the data to show why amateur power levels should be reduced. The FOB deals regularly with RFI and TVI complaints from the public. Some hams fear that the information will be used to



# W5YI REPORT

National Volunteer Examiner Coordinator

Page #2

April 1, 1991

support power restrictions to reduce RFI, instead of enforcement of RFI-immunity standards for consumer products.

The Field Operations Bureau says it performed the tests in conjunction with the Private Radio Bureau (PRB) and will give the data to the PRB, which regulates the Amateur Service. "I don't know how they will use the data," a FOB official said. ***But the PRB says it did not request the inspections and has no plans to use the power level data.***

Robert McNamara, Chief, PRB Special Services Division told us, "No, we did not ask for this inspection program. It was one item in a large, thick document that was an agency-wide enforcement plan. The FOB says they will supply us with the data, but we have no plans to do anything with it. There is no plot to reduce amateur power, and it is not a part of any rulemaking to affect the existing rules. No one is laying claim as to how that [power audits] got in there."

## Scope of program

We obtained more details on the program from an interview conducted by **Benn Kobb, KC5CW** and posted on CompuServe's *HamNet Forum*. He interviewed Dan Emrick, Chief, Investigations and Inspections at the FCC Field Operations Bureau:

**Q:** Does the FCC have a special program to make power audits at ham stations? Is it still going on?

**A:** It was the February 1991 Amateur Survey and it was a special period to visit amateur stations. We did not term these 'power audits'. The program was done in conjunction with the Private Radio Bureau. The concerted push is now concluded, but that does not mean we will not continue to inspect stations when necessary.

One of the tests performed was to ask the operator to change power. The process for our inspectors was to either begin the inspection while the amateur was in QSO, or to ask the amateur to go on the air and get data from the station at the other end of the contact.

In one case, an inspector went in and had a contact with another station that was also being inspected. They had our people at both ends of the link. But this happened by chance.

**Q:** Were these surprise inspections?

**A:** In some cases the amateurs were contacted ahead of time; in some cases they were not. That decision was left to the Engineers-In-Charge.

**Q:** What was the purpose of the survey?

**A:** One of the purposes was to evaluate how much difference changing the power would have on communications.

The Amateur Radio rules require that stations use the minimum power necessary. So we wanted to gather some information on the extent of compliance with that rule section. Also, this was an opportunity for our field personnel to take some time in the amateur service, which they don't get much time to do.

**Q:** What were your conclusions and how will the information be used?

**A:** I'm not sure how conclusive the program was. The data are not all in yet. We will report the data to the Private Radio Bureau. I don't know how they will use it.

**Q:** How many inspections were done and how did you choose which stations to visit?

**A:** There were around 200 visits. We had certain categories for choosing a station to visit. For example, one category was a station for which you already had done pre-inspection on-the-air monitoring.

Another category was, whether or not pre-inspection monitoring had been done, a station against which RFI complaints had been filed.

If it didn't fit the above categories, we told them to find an amateur station that you could get to without too much difficulty. Get the database and find someone at home who operates HF.

WOULD YOU LIKE TO BECOME A VOLUNTEER EXAMINER?  
under the W5YI Report Program? If so, please send a copy of  
"I am a currently licensed operator in Wisl. I be  
Advanced, Extra Class amateur radio  
I have I do not own a sig



**April 1, 1991**

*The preceding article was written and filed by our Washington DC office.*



# W5YI REPORT

National Volunteer Examiner Coordinator

Page #4

April 1, 1991

## PHONE CALL WITH FCC CHIEF, F.O.B.

I had no idea that our Washington Office had already interviewed Dan Emrick when I telephoned Richard M. Smith, Chief of the FCC's Field Operations Bureau. I asked Dick, "Why the amateur power surveys?" I found Dick Smith very willing to discuss them. It was an enjoyable conversation. Follows is a [slightly edited for clarity] transcription.

"Part of our ongoing enforcement compliance philosophy is that from time to time we want to pause from our very hectic daily normal response oriented workload ...every day we get calls and complaints and we respond to individual problems all over the country and interference cases. It takes pretty much all of our time ...in fact we could spend 100% of our time just responding to problems.

"The philosophy we have right now which (FCC) Chairman Sikes and I have put together jointly is that from time to time we need to pause, stop and put things on hold for a couple of days and go out and address issues which we think are important to look at for three reasons.

"One, to find out what is going on in a particular area; two, [to determine] if there a need for enforcement ...compliance is really what this F.O.B. bureau is all about. We are the compliance arm of the FCC and, three; to provide guidance where needed which is just as important as enforcement. Education, I suspect, is responsible most of the compliance that we get ...the 80/20 rule. We probably get about 80% from education and about 20% from our enforcement program.

"So what we have been doing, as you may have noticed, is to take a week almost every month ...and at least a couple of days during that week, to have the field offices all across the nation go out and look at a particular area. One of the very first ones we did ...was to look at 'Alternative [telephone] Operator Services.' The reason we looked at that one [was] the Commission in both the field offices and Common Carrier Bureau were getting a complaints that the FCC rules were not being complied with. In some cases consumers were

really outraged at certain practices. So we went out ...it was out very first one. It was kind of a prototype [and] it worked so well that we have been doing it on some other subjects.

"A more recent one was on antenna tower painting and lighting. We went out and visited a little over a thousand stations of all services ...not just broadcast, where the towers are tall enough that they might need to be marked and lit with flashing lights. The beauty of this [program] is that we get a pretty good fix on what the level of compliance is, whether or not enforcement is needed and also we do some education in the process. The simple fact that we went out and visited a thousand towers certainly got us a lot of press attention and [allowed us to] get the word out directly to the licensees on their responsibilities.

"While the AOS (Alternate Operator Services) was purely Common Carrier, the antenna tower survey involved all of the services. We did a couple (of surveys) in broadcast ...one on AM emissions this past year having to do with some new rules that went into effect. The Commission has been interested in improving the AM radio service because it has been taking a downside from FM. Its fortunes have slipped for various reasons ...some are technical since FM modulation has a lot of advantages over AM. [The FCC] wrote some new technical specs and we went out after the rule was in effect. We visited AM stations ...it might have been something like 300 ...to determine if they were complying with the new rule. It turned out that they were ...the compliance was almost 100% ...frankly, I was pleasantly surprised.

"What I am leading up to is that we have a new philosophy here ...a new approach where on the average of about once a month ...we go out nationwide and look at some aspect of the communication's industry that, for whatever reason, we think we need to know something about or we need to correct a problem ...or maybe we need to just identify whether or not there is a problem.

### *The amateur power inspections*

"I don't have and can't discuss the results, but I can tell you why we were out there. We want to

The Radio Amateur's LICENSING HANDBOOK is for everyone who gets involved in ham licenses ...it's for non-hams who

NEW!

Only \$9.95

plus \$2.00 shipping charge  
Col. ... is all (only \$2.00) questions, multiple choice, answer from



look at the amateur's compliance with the power rule which if you read it, says you should use the minimum power necessary to establish and maintain communications. I suspect if you ask the average amateur on the street, 'What's your power limitation?', the immediate answer would be 1,500 watts P.E.P. We think, we are not sure, that is what most amateurs would believe is the power rule. That is not the right answer.

"We think, again we don't know for sure, that amateurs do not pay enough attention to what is the first and most important part of the [amateur power] rule which says use only the power necessary. The second part of the rule says '...but in any case do not use more than 1,500 watts.' That is why we are looking at that issue.

"And why are we looking at that? Well, because the field bureau ...not the Private Radio Bureau, gets the interference complaints. The field bureau has to respond to these people who are very, very angry at the amateur community. The field bureau has to try and resolve those problems and it has been very difficult.

"We have been dealing with TVI since 'day one.' I used to work on TVI complaints as one of my first jobs when I first came to the Commission in 1963. Six meter interference to TV channel two was the big deal then. By the time the complainant's called the FCC, they were pretty angry.

"For all these many years, the field bureau has had the problem of trying to resolve these complaints. Many times the amateur technically is in compliance with the FCC rules in terms of not having spurious emissions beyond the limits and otherwise complying with the technical standards. But the one rule that seems to be most appropriate now with many of the interference cases that we are getting involving audio devices has to do with the operating power.

"No other radio service ...repeat, **no other radio service** licensed by the FCC allows power of the magnitude of 1,500 watts maximum in residential areas. Even those services which are not in residential areas are generally limited to less; the exception of course is 'broadcast.'

"Look at cellular telephone. What is the limit? Five hundred watts at a cell site? Look at most Land Mobile transmitters ...and even repeaters; 100, maybe 200 watts? Tell me a radio service, particularly in the residential area, that is allowed to operate with anything close to 1,500 watts?

"I can't talk to you at this time about the results of the survey because I will not have them until later this week. In AOS we had a lot of follow up. Congress even got into the act. Two of the more than half dozen surveys we have done has resulted in not only Commission action, but action by Congress as well ...at least as far as having hearings looking into if they should enact some legislation. There could be all kinds of follow up including Commission action ...and even as I mentioned in those two cases; Congressional action depending on the results.

"As I say, I don't have the results yet so it is kind of hard to predict what kind of follow up action might be required. In the case of marking and painting of the towers; we had only 86% compliance and for a safety service item like that we would want to have something like 95% before we abandon that and go onto something else. Of course we would like to 100% but nothing is perfect. In the case of antenna painting and lighting, we are going to go back and revisit that. We are going to do some more, one of these days. In the case of (broadcast) AM emissions we found almost 100% compliance and we are not going to waste our time going back on that. That is a non-problem and we won't be back.

"The particular (survey) subjects, I take responsibility for. There is a lot of people involved, however. In some cases my own staff would come up with an idea ...sometimes staff from another bureau. I am not taking credit for the original idea (of surveying amateur power) but I take responsibility for the decision on which subjects go out.

"The Commissioners are normally not involved in the specifics. What I was talking about, in my discussions with the Chairman was more of a philosophy, the techniques, the methodology, the approach ...the change; instead of just continuing on day-to-day... each office working on what-



ever happens to come to their attention that day when the phone rings or the public calls, whatever. One office will be working on a broadcast matter ...another office on an FAA interference ...another office working on a marine issue and so forth. From time to time ...approximately once a month, we will take a few days and on those specified days all thirty-five field offices would go out across the country and take a look at a particular subject. The most recent one, of course, is this amateur power.

"If I find the compliance (on amateur power) is very high, such as it was in the AM radio one, then I don't see any need to go back there. If the compliance is very low, then something else needs to be done, doesn't it? Maybe the 'something else' is education ...maybe it is enforcement ...maybe it is rule making, I don't know. The possibilities are all over the place. It depends on the [survey] outcome.

## *Radio interference complaints*

"It seems like ...it is just not the numbers, either, it is the intensity of the [interference] complaints that has gone up. When the neighborhood calls in now, they don't accept the old story that the amateur has a license, it is not their fault that you are getting their signal on the telephone; it is the telephone's fault. It gets complicated because it is hard to place responsibility today ...is it the phone company, is it the equipment that the complainant owns, is it the manufacturer of that equipment ...who is responsible for this situation? It is hard to pinpoint the blame.

"The complainant today is less easily satisfied. They are just not going to take the answer that it is their fault ...their responsibility to fix - any more. We are seeing that more and more. They are writing their Congressman ...and complaining more because of this one amateur disrupting a neighborhood. They ask the question, where is the public interest here? No other radio service is allowed to have this kind of power level. Why should an amateur have this power level? Why should one person disrupt the tranquility ...the peace and quiet and enjoyment of other citizens in their homes through no fault of theirs. This is

their view now. I know the amateur's view, too. The public view is, "Look, we are not doing anything to the amateur. We just want to use our telephone. It is not my fault."

"The home is full of stuff now to be interfered with ...intercoms, wireless doorbells, you name it. Everybody has a lot of devices. You just don't have a simple telephone any more ...you've got at least a telephone answering machine/recorder ...maybe a FAX. FAXes are not only in the office, they are getting into homes. People have all kinds of things in their homes now that are subject to being interfered with by nearby amateurs.

"The amateur complaints have gone up a little whereas overall complaints have gone down. I think this is being driven primarily by CB. The continued demise of the Citizen's Band which had traditionally been the largest contributor has caused interference complaints to go down. The amateur complaints have stayed steady and a slight increasing trend. I would not say the numbers have dramatically increased, but I think the more important emphasis is on the nature of the complaints now. They are more difficult to resolve. The complainants are less happy with the story that they have to do something to their equipment. They are not accepting that like they once did.

## *High power DX operation*

"If everybody used the same amount of power in the contests, everybody could get by with much less than the 1,500 watts allowable. Our (survey) methodology in general was to go in and have a contact established at some power level ...maybe the maximum power level. Then reduce the power in half and see if the conversation could continue; reduce the power in half again; and reduce it again ...until at some point you no longer can carry on the communications. Then a notation is made of what power level you had to reduce it down to before the communication was no longer possible.

"As I say, I have not seen any of the results yet. I am anxious to see them. I hope to have them this week ...at least for my own use. I am not



# W5YI REPORT

National Volunteer Examiner Coordinator

Page #7

April 1, 1991

sure when they will be ready for release ...not until we complete our analysis here. Before the end of the month I would hope we will at least have something that we would feel comfortable in releasing.

"You are interested in what might happen now. One of the things that might happen is that we will put out a Public Notice. Hopefully we will get some publicity in the amateur community that we have done this and here are the results and we just want to remind the amateurs that this is the power rule and it might be to everybody's benefit to comply with it. The FCC, frankly, has never stringently enforced this rule in the past ...at least we have not paid a lot of attention to it in the past - nor have the amateurs. Maybe things have changed and we all need to pay attention to the power rule -- maybe that is what will come out of this." (Conversation: March 21, 1991)

## EXAMINATION STATISTICS FOR FEBRUARY 1991

The FCC advises that they received 313 applications for the new **Codeless Technician** operator license in February 1991. The first license, **N3IFY** was issued to **Robert N. Williams** of Annapolis, Maryland, on March 12. The coordinating VEC was the Laurel Radio Club.

The FCC also reminds VEs: "To obtain a telegraphy CSCE (Certificate of Successful Completion of Examination) to upgrade by examination to **Technician Plus** [5 WPM code] after qualifying for a **Codeless Technician**, the examination must be administered in the [3 examiner] VEC System, not in the Novice [2 VE] program.

The ARRL has requested that VEs be allowed to give examination credit for a CSCE that expired during the holder's deployment in the Persian Gulf an additional six month term. The FCC wrote all VEC's on March 19, "If your VEs receive such a request, have them file the application form with a **Request for Waiver of Section §97.505(a)(3)** and a copy of their military orders for service in the Gulf. Each case will be considered on a case-by-case basis." The FCC added, "Hopefully, this will not inspire others to request a waiver. Such requests are routinely denied."

## FEBRUARY 1991 VE PROGRAM STATISTICS

<u>February</u> <u>No. VEC's</u>	<u>1989</u> <u>*62</u>	<u>1990</u> <u>*18</u>	<u>1991</u> <u>*18</u>
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------

<u>Testing Sessions</u>	<u>400</u>	<u>421</u>	<u>469</u>
-------------------------	------------	------------	------------

<u>VEC</u>	<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>
W5YI	34.8%	33.0%	43.5%
ARRL	40.0	44.2	33.1
CAVEC	6.5	6.2	4.9
DeVRY	6.0	3.6	4.3
SunV			2.8
Others (14)	11.9	13.0	11.4
<b>Year-to-Date Sessions</b>	<b>754</b>	<b>883</b>	<b>850</b>

<u>Elements Administ.</u>	<u>7284</u>	<u>7371</u>	<u>8076</u>
---------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

<u>VEC</u>	<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>
W5YI	28.7%	27.1%	35.3%
ARRL	43.6	48.1	35.1
SunV			6.5
CAVEC	7.1	7.2	5.7
DeVRY	5.2	2.5	4.4
Others (14)	15.4	15.1	13.0
<b>Year-to-Date Elements</b>	<b>12936</b>	<b>14700</b>	<b>13914</b>

<u>Applicants Tested</u>	<u>4311</u>	<u>4336</u>	<u>4995</u>
--------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

<u>VEC</u>	<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>
W5YI	29.1%	27.5%	36.4%
ARRL	43.4	47.4	33.8
SunV			6.5
CAVEC	6.7	6.6	5.0
DeVRY	4.9	2.7	5.2
Others (14)	15.9	15.8	13.1
<b>Year-to-Date Tested</b>	<b>7624</b>	<b>8703</b>	<b>8609</b>

<u>February</u>	<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>
-----------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Pass Rate - All	61.7%	61.3%	63.1%
Applicants/Session	10.8	10.3	10.7
Elements/Applicant	1.7	1.7	1.6
Sessions Per VEC	22.2 (*)	23.3	26.1

## Administrative Errors by VE's/VEC's

<u>February</u>	<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>
Defect. Applications	0.4%	0.7%	0.7%
Late Filed Sessions	0.5%	0.7%	1.7%
Defective Reports	1.3%	0.5%	0.0%

(\*) Note: The FCC previously considered ARRL, W5YI and DeVry to be 13 VEC's each since VEC's initially were appointed on a regional basis. Since any VEC may now coordinate examinations in any region, the FCC reduced the number of VEC Regions (62) to VEC Organizations (18.) We have adjusted 1989 figures to reflect this change.

[Source: Personal Radio Branch/FCC; Washington, D.C.]



● The following FCC Press Release was issued after the March 14th FCC Commissioners meeting. The text of the Order is not yet available, but use of 220-222 MHz by Amateur Radio Operators is coming to an end.

## **"FCC Adopts New Rules for Use of 220-222 MHz Band by Private Land Mobile Licensees"**

The Commission has established service rules for the use of the 220-222 MHz band by private Land Mobile licensees. Creation of these new service rules for Land Mobile use will aid in promoting the evolution and further development of narrowband technology.

In 1988, the Commission reallocated the 220-222 MHz band from the shared Fixed, Land Mobile and Amateur Services to private and federal government Land Mobile use only. The Commission's objective in reallocating these frequencies was to provide unused spectrum for the development of spectrally efficient narrowband technologies. Today's action established rules by which the Commission can grant licenses for Land Mobile service in the reallocated band.

The two megahertz available in the 220-222 MHz band will be allocated in 400 five kHz-wide frequencies, paired to create 200 narrowband channels. Channels will be set aside for nationwide and local applicants. Ten of the nationwide channels will be set aside exclusively for Government use. All of the local channels will be available on a co-equal basis for Government and non-Government licensees.

The Commission said that all applications for licenses in this band will be granted on a first-come, first-served basis. Applications filed on the same day for more than the number of channels

or channel groups available will be subject to a lottery. Non-nationwide licenses will have a five-year license term and must be constructed and placed in operation within eight months of the license grant. Because nationwide licensees will need a significant period of time to implement their systems, they will have a 10-year license term and their systems must be constructed and placed in operation according to a schedule of benchmarks at 2, 4, 6 and 10 years.

Finally, applications may be filed only for primary Land Mobile uses, although Fixed and Paging uses ancillary to Land Mobile operations will be permitted. All transmissions must meet certain technical standards. The Commission is adopting fixed mileage separation criteria to permit co-channel reuse for non-nationwide channels.

Applications will be accepted for filing beginning the second day after publication of this *Report and Order* in the *Federal Register*. Applications for nationwide licenses must be accompanied by the appropriate filing fee (\$35 per call sign -- a separate call sign is required for each channel in each geographic area). For example, a 10-channel nationwide system serving a required minimum number of 70 geographic areas would have a filing fee of \$24,500.

Nationwide licensees must meet financial and construction entry criteria for an application to be acceptable for filing. Because Commission collection of information regarding these criteria is subject to *Office of Management and Budget* (OMB) approval, applications for nationwide licenses may initially be submitted without this information. While this guarantees applicants a 'place in the processing line,' the Commission will, after OMB approval, require this information to determine final acceptabil-

ity of filed applications.

Amateurs must discontinue all operations in the 220-222 MHz band 90 days following the effective date of these rules." [Action by the Commission, March 14, 1991, by Report and Order, PR Docket 89-552]

● The ARRL request for amateurs to share the 220-222 MHz band on a secondary basis was denied. Ham move-out day will likely be about August 1, 1991. We will have more to say on this matter when we receive the paperwork ...hopefully before our next issue.

● The *Mid-America Coordination Council, Inc.* has filed a *Petition for Rulemaking* requesting an amendment to Part 97.311(b) concerning unintentional interference to carrier-operated repeaters by stations operating with spread-spectrum (SS) emission. MACC represents repeater owners in Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Oklahoma, Minnesota, Colorado, Arkansas, Indiana and Ohio.

MACC Coordination Chairman, **Whitman E. Brown, WB0CIX**, of Golden, Colorado, argues, "It cannot be effectively argued that Spread Spectrum is a mode which promotes a spectrum efficient means of communication, when in fact it could alter the operational characteristics of thousands of existing, coordinated repeaters. The military and State Department did not utilize SS emission in an effort to enhance spectrum management and efficiency. Its primary purpose, development and implementation was to mask enciphered communiques for Department and other security-oriented agencies." He said he "...had operational exposure to SS while in supportive capacity electronic countermeasures in the U.S. Navy.

Brown maintains that low power SS operation in the 70-cm band



causes an increase in the noise floor and several stations operating with higher power "...would eventually cause carrier accessed repeaters to lock-up and eventually time out, thus rendering them inaccessible."

MACC wants the last sentence of §97.311(b) removed from the rules which states that "...unintended triggering of carrier operated repeaters is not considered to be harmful interference." The petition footnotes three supporting technical references. [Filed with the Commission on Feb. 22, 1991]

● **"Requests for Spectrum Swamp FCC"** is the title of an article in a Recent issue of *Communications Week*. Another issue has a story on **"How to Stretch Spectrum?"** The Feb. 25th edition of **"Network World"** reports **"Squabble Over Radio Spectrum Heats Up!"**

Such services as CT2/Advanced Cordless Telephones, Data PCN (Personal Communications Networks), PCS (Personal Communications Services), DAB (Digital Audio Broadcasting), MSS (new Mobile Satellite Services), HDTV (High Definition Television), Land Mobile needs and more... are all clamoring for more frequencies. There simply isn't any; the entire usable radio spectrum has already been allocated.

The new spectrum buzz-word is "re-farming." That simply means "displacing" one user and reassigning his spectrum to another. FCC Chairman Alfred Sikes told Congress a couple of weeks ago that current licensed microwave users could anticipate having their spectrum "re-farmed" to emerging wireless voice and data communications technologies.

The spectrum primarily in jeopardy is that used by the utility, petroleum, public safety and railroad industries. Some will be asked to move to other than radio

frequencies such as fiber-optic cable.

So-called "finder's" and "pioneer's preference" proposals will allow entrepreneurs who discover inefficiently used frequencies or engineers who develop new technologies to have advantages or "spectrum bidding credits."

The *National Telecommunications and Information Administration* (NTIA) and the FCC is currently examining the radio spectrum to determine where future technologies might be accommodated. NTIA says spectrum management changes are needed because federal use of spectrum has increased 55% and private use by 60% in the last ten years and is expected to continue expanding.

Both the NTIA (the telecommunications advisor to the White House - in addition to overseeing federal spectrum use) and the FCC are in favor of frequency leasing, licensee sub-leasing, royalty payments, competitive bidding and outright resale as the primary means of distributing the scarce radio spectrum.

They want a "market-based" approach to spectrum apportionment rather than a "government give-away" to encourage more efficient spectrum use. At present, it is not lawful to sell frequencies.

The FCC says they need a special reserve of 350 MHz (to be taken from the 1 to 3 gigahertz band) for reassignment to new voice and data PCN, digital radio and other advanced cellular technologies.

The *Emerging Telecommunications Act of 1991* proposes to reassign 200 MHz of government spectrum to the FCC for later distribution to the private sector. The NTIA now says they will go along if certain criteria are met.

It never ceases to amaze me what we use radio for. This month, Japan's beverage giants (including Coca-Cola) will begin installing

POS (point-of-sale) Radio Communication Networks to link their vending machines with nearby distribution centers. A radio signal alerts the distributor when to come and fill the machine!

● It appears all is set to go for the **Space Shuttle STS-37** liftoff on April 4 at 1420 UTC. Aboard Atlantis will be the **SAREX (Shuttle Amateur Radio Experiment)** equipment. All five crew members are licensed hams! Astronauts are scheduled to communicate directly with school children the following day! Contacts will be made using both voice and slow-scan television.

● **John Shalamskas, KJ9U**, advises the best time to work Soviet cosmonaut **Musa (pronounced Moo-sah) Manarov/U2MIR** "live" aboard the MIR space station is weekends from 05:00 - 20:00 Friday - Monday UTC. (145.550 MHz)

● **Israeli hams** holding Class A tickets now get to use the six meter ham band between 50.1 and 50.150 MHz. Output power not to exceed 25 watts.

● Did you see the one paragraph no-code announcement in the Feb. 14th *Wall Street Journal*? It says **"HAM, HOLD THE MORSE:** Starting today, some U.S. ham radio operators won't need to learn Morse Code to get a license. The FCC creates a new license class for short-ranges, to open the door to users put off by the Morse Code barrier."

● The FCC's St. Paul Field Office **traced a bomb threat** using radio direction finding techniques to the residence of John Berken, 22, of Shakopee, Minnesota. He was arrested for threatening to blow up the Eden Prairie airport in a radio message transmitted on a FAA air traffic control channel.



## AMATEUR PETITIONS FOR GLOBAL HAM LICENSING

**Stephen R. Hutchins, KN6G** (and DA2HS) has filed a very well written and researched *Petition for Rule-making* with the FCC seeking a broader and simpler Amateur Radio operating arrangement between the United States and members of the *Conference of European Administrations of Post and Telecommunication*, (CEPT) "...in order to reduce administrative costs associated with issuing Alien Operator Permits by recognition of the CEPT amateur radio license..." The petition requests that the United States participate in the CEPT member country common Amateur Radio licensing scheme. These countries include nearly all of Europe, Scandinavia and the United Kingdom.

Hutchins, originally from California, spent 20 years in the U.S. Force and now makes his home in Germany. He is president of the *Wiesbaden Amateur Radio Club* located in Wiesbaden, Germany. The club, which operates as a private organization at Lindsey Air Station, Germany, represents U.S. Amateur Radio operators interests within the Federal Republic of Germany.

Reciprocal FCC licensing agreements already exist between the United States and twenty-two of the thirty-one CEPT member countries. Hutchins contends that obtaining an Amateur Radio reciprocal permit is a time consuming, cumbersome burden for all Amateurs (foreign and domestic) ...and needlessly very costly to the governments involved. He says a common licensing arrangement such as now employed in Europe is better for all concerned.

Hutchins argues Amateur reciprocal operating application forms are different for each country and are not available to the FCC. They must be submitted to each country to be visited 60-90 days in advance of the planned trip and the permits take a long time to obtain. The Wiesbaden Amateur Radio Club wants the FCC to consider approaching CEPT to show their interest in extending the common ham ticket to nations outside of Europe. This is in accordance with a CEPT proposal which states in part:

"In the early 1980's, several European countries introduced bilateral agreements regarding the recognition of their amateur licenses as well as granting general operational rights to each other's radio amateurs. These agreements worked well, and led to the adoption, in 1985, of CEPT Recommendation T/R 61-01. This recommendation has now worked successfully for five years, and by 1990, 16 out of the 26 CEPT states have joined the agreement, representing about 90% of

the licensed radio amateurs in the CEPT region. In recent years there have been increasing calls for non-CEPT countries to be allowed to participate.

"The agreement has not only meant a reduction in the administrative burden placed on the PTT administrations, but has also has made things simpler for the Amateur Radio Service in the participating countries. Wider participation would be welcomed by the licensing authorities of non-CEPT countries as well as the Amateur Radio Societies of those countries and the *International Amateur Radio Union* (IARU.) If non-CEPT countries were able to join the CEPT [common amateur licensing scheme] there would be no longer any need for individual agreements on reciprocal licensing.

"It is therefore considered desirable that interested non-member administrations should approach CEPT with a view to finding a way in which they may participate..."

Because of the tremendous success experienced with a common European Amateur Radio License the *International Amateur Radio Union* (IARU) Region 1, has recommended that each CEPT member country's Amateur Radio Society request their respective Telecommunications Administration to extend the CEPT common Amateur Radio licensing arrangement to include voluntary participation by administrations which are not members of CEPT.

The petition states, "The adoption and implementation of CEPT [common licensing] by the FCC allowing licensed Amateur Radio operators who are citizens of CEPT member countries to operate in the U.S., would surely demonstrate its willingness to create the type of environment which supports the basis and purpose of the Amateur Radio Service as stated in the FCC Rules and Regulations, Subpart A, §97.1..."

Hutchins suggests that "CEPT Class 1 authorizations may not exceed the control operator privileges of an FCC-issued Amateur Extra Class operator license and ...will use their home call signs prefixed with W/;" while "CEPT Class 2 authorizations may not exceed the control operator privileges of an FCC-issued Technician Plus Class operator license and ...will use their home call sign prefixed with N/."

"Allowing the CEPT operation in the U.S. is not the ultimate solution to a true common license," Hutchins told us, "and this petition should not detract from other attempts to create a common license." The FCC received the Petition for Rulemaking on March 13th.